President's reply.—You have already pointed out the provisions contained in the Forest Regulation which govern the matter. You may rest assured that it is not the intention of the Government to handicap the planters in the matter of the protection of their person and property. The subject is one which does not easily admit of very definite instructions being issued applicable to all cases. All that the Government are particular about is that wanton injury or wanton destruction shall not be caused to elephants. You have made pointed reference to the rules. At the same time, when the injury amounts to killing, the Government's policy which underlies the legislation on the subject requires that the burden of proving that there are proper circumstances which justified or would justify the causing of death is on the person who causes the death of the animal. In all cases where a plea of self-defence is raised it is very difficult to gauge the situation and to correctly find out the proper circumstances and judge of the acts of persons whose lives and property are threatened. You may rest assured that a liberal interpretation will be put on the rules. So far as the rules are concerned, I understand that a set of rules has been drawn up by the Conservator and that they have been referred to the Sirkar Vakil. He has not yet sent in his reply. He will be asked to expedite the same.

(3) Excise.

20. Free import of Java brandy into Travancore, as also whisky, gin and beer from other countries, and permission to vend the products of Indian breweries.

Mr. Chandi Mani (Member, Trading Classes, Kottayam) said that the import of Java products, consisting of brandy, whisky and gin, had been restricted from 1095 onwards on its being found that the arrack supply contractors were unable to compete successfully with Java brandy. The Member mentioned that there was an increasing demand for the above varieties of Java liquor, as the stock of foreign liquor with the merchants was very low. In the estates of the Peermade taluk where epidemics broke out every year, the cooly classes were accustomed to take the cheaper varieties of liquor imported from Java for medicinal purposes.

The Member also requested the permission of the Government for the vend of beer and other products of the Indian breweries to the advantage of the merchants and the public alike, as the price of the liquor imported from foreign countries was very high.

President's reply.—Your suggestion seems to go, to a great extent, against the temperance movement which has got such good hold on the people, and I regret that the proposal is not one which can be approved of by the Government.

III. PROTECTION—LEGISLATION, CRIMINAL AND CIVIL JUSTICE.

21. Legislation for the prohibition of cow slaughter.

Mr. R. Sivaramakrishna Aiyar (Member, Municipal Council, Kuzhitturai) began by saying that the existence of cows was important both for the supply of milk and for the development of agriculture, and that the importance of milk as an article of diet was recognised both by the vegetarian and non-vegetarian. The vitality of the average Indian was very low when compared with that of his brother in Europe or America. Though this comparatively low vitality was not due entirely to the absence of a sufficient quantity of pure milk, it could not be denied that the supply of unadulterated milk would go a long way to build up a healthy physique. On account of the diminishing quantity of pure cow's milk, in towns specially, there was going on a process of adulteration which led to several diseases like tuberculosis. Another evil was that the price of this apology for pure milk was going up. Such a state of affairs was the result of the annual diminution of milch cows which were being slaughtered for beef. Unlike in Europe, America or elsewhere, cattle in India were bred only for milk supply and not for beef. It was, therefore, all the more necessary that cows—milch cows especially—should be protected from slaughter by legislation. Agriculture also suffered on account of the indiscriminate killing of cattle. Bulls and other head of cattle were required for ploughing and other agricultural operations, and their gradual decrease in numbers would affect the interests of agriculture, as it had done already; for, when cattle decreased, there was naturally a decline in the quantity of farm-yard manure produced, so necessary for cultivation of all kinds. It was on these and other important grounds that the Economic

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Development Board had submitted a recommendation to the Government to enact a law to prohibit the slaughter of cows and bulls in the state. The subject was discussed at one of the sessions of the Legislative Council and also in the Press and on the platform which reflected the opinion of the public. The Member proceeded to argue his point on humanitarian grounds and quoted Regulation IV of 1079 and Regulation XII of 1089 as instances in which the Government had taken such action. The State of Kashmir was cited and the Member pointed out that it was the bounden duty of a Hindu State to intervene and stop the slaughter of cows. He then pleaded for more grazing lands as another measure for the protection and better breeding of cows, as it was generally the underfed cow that was being slaughtered. In conclusion, he requested that a law be enacted prohibiting the slaughter of cows at an early date or, in the alternative, to appoint a committee to report to the Government about the present condition of bovine animals in the State, and the feasibility of enacting a law in the interests of public health and the promotion of agriculture.

22. Immediate prohibition of cow slaughter.

Mr. Parameswaran Narayanan Bhattatiri (Member, Jenmi, Quilon Division) said that he did not want to waste the time of the Assembly by repeating the arguments advanced by the previous Member. He advocated the immediate prohibition of cow slaughter, firstly because this State was being ruled by a Hindu Ruler, secondly, on humanitarian grounds, thirdly on grounds of public health, and lastly in the interests of agriculture.

The Member presented a memorial on the subject signed by 23 members of the Assembly.

President's reply.—As regards the prohibition of cow-slaughter, I may state that a resolution on the subject was moved in the Legislative Council recently and that it was lost. The request of Mr. Sivaramakrishna Aiyar for the appointment of a committee to go into the question and the other suggestions contained in his speech and that of Mr. Parameswaran Narayanan Bhattatiri are noted.

23. The Ezhava Bill.

Mr. K. Padmanabhan Vaidyan (Member, Nominated) referred to the sad and premature death of Mr. N. Kumaran Asan, who for several years was a useful member of the Assembly, and expressed the gratitude of the community for the valuable services Mr. Asan had rendered on their behalf.

The Member next stated that the Ezhava Bill in its present form was highly detrimental to the interests of the *Misradaya* section of Ezhavas. The Member traced the history of the Bill and said that it owed its birth to the representations made at successive sessions of the Assembly by Ezhava Members. He then explained how the Ezhava Law Committee was appointed, how the examination of witnesses was proceeded with, in spite of protests, and how the final form assumed by the Bill was extremly one-sided. Coming to the later stages of the Bill, the Member said that, when it was being read for a second time in the Legislative Council, the inhabitants of Chirayinkil, Neyyattinkara, Nedumangad, Trivandrum, Quilon and Kottarakara waited on the Dewan and represented their grievances. They were then told that their grievances would be looked into. Since then the nature of the passage of the Bill through the Council was such that they were afraid of the danger ahead and had resolved to submit their grievances once again. The masses of the population among them were not educated enough to gauge the merits and demerits of the Bill. Though it was alleged that the Bill contained provisions which were in the best interests of the community, such a view was not upheld by those whom he represented. The law of inheritance and succession among *Misradayees* had been frequently laid down by the High Court and those decisions had won the approval of the community. The Government and the Legislative Council should give their recognition to those recorded pronouncements of the High Court. Nothing contrary to such pronouncements should be attempted so far as the *Misradayees* were concerned. The Member then proceeded to consider the Ezhava Bill in detail and entered his strong protest against section 31 of the Bill. He submitted that the amendment in that respect did not satisfy his section of the community and that they had therefore asked him to once again submit their well-considered views.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly